

Discussion Questions for December 14, 2010, Science-Policy Workshop

Policy-Science Interface Dialogue Questions for 3:15 p.m. Discussion

1. In any of your PSP related activities to date, were you ever limited in making progress by a lack of scientific (natural and social) information?
2. Where specifically has a lack of scientific (natural or social) information limited your ability to move forward with recovery of Puget Sound by 2020?
3. What kind of questions should the policy bodies be asking the Science Panel and what kind of questions should the Science Panel ask the policy bodies?
4. In your experience with other science-policy interactions what allowed some to succeed (e.g. how they were organized, who participated, facilitation) and some to be less successful?

Target Setting Discussion Questions

1. Are the Puget Sound Science Update (PSSU) summaries for “target setting” understandable (are they relevant to today’s pol-sci discussion?)
2. How should the target setting discussion in the PSSU (and summary doc) affect the next action agenda, near term PSP work, science needs that could be identified in the BSWP?
3. The involvement of the Management Conference (Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board, Science Panel) in target setting can be sequenced in different ways. For example: targets could be set by a small sci-pol body (i.e. cross-partnership workgroups) with future discussion by the Management Conference focused on how to achieve those targets. Alternatively, targets could be set through a full Management Conference processes that may reveal where science can help because the process is stalled by a lack of knowledge, philosophy, and/or economics.

Threats Discussion Questions

1. Are the PSSU summaries for “threats” understandable (are they relevant to today’s pol-sci discussion?)
2. If the Puget Sound Partnership invests time doing threats ranking, should this information guide spending priorities?
3. Should threats be characterized by action area and rolled up, which would link Action Agenda priorities to regional priorities, or should we start with what we think the greatest regional threats are right now?